Rhetorick Restrained,

OR,

Dr. *John Gauden* Lord Bishop Elect of *Exeter*, His Considerations of the Liturgy of the Church of *England* considered and clouded.

By *Thomas Bolde*, *Exon.*

Attested by *Zech. Crofton* Presbyter.

John 3. 9. *I wrote unto the Church, but* Diotrephes, *who loveth to have the preheminence among them, receiveth us not.*

10. *Wherefore, if* I *come,* I *will remember his deeds which he doth, prating against us with malicious words: and not content therewith, neither, doth he himself receive the brethren, and forbiddeth them that would, and casteth them out of the Church.*

11. *Beloved, follow not that which is evil, but that which is good.*

LONDON,

Printed for *Tho. Parkhurst* at the *Three Crownes* over against the great Conduit at the lower end of *Cheap-side*, 1660.

BIBLIOTHECA NATIONALIS

1X.

RHETORICK RESTRAINED,

OR,

Dr. *John Gauden* Lord Bishop Elect of *Exeter*, His Considerations of the Liturgy of the Church of *England* considered and clouded.

Reverend Sir,

FOR so I can and will call you in point of good manners, though *Reverend Father in God*, with a *may it please your Grace*, I decline, as a Title which hath in it *aliquid Antichristi.*)

Amongst the many reformation-retarding and retrograding-Pamphlets, which now flie abroad, I meet with some *Considerations of the Liturgy of the Church of* England, *by* John Gauden *D. D. and Lord Bishop Elect of* Exeter; which, reverence to your name (of late renowned for your bootless attempt to release *the solemn League and Covenant*) engaged me to take up and read; wherein your Rhetorick pleas'd my fancy, better then your Reason did inform my judgement. In your loosing St. *Peters* bonds.

And seeing none other will be at the trouble, my nonconformity (offensive to our now rising Prelacy)

giving me a little leisure, I shall make bold to recommend it back to your second thoughts with this short and plain Expostulation.

The immodesty of his Title.

Was, Sir, your Title drawn by your own Pen? It is very probable it was; I cannot but enquire with what measure of modesty you wrote your self *Lord Bishop Elect*; most Divines and knowing Christians, judg an election to *Episcopacy*, to be an election to *Ministry*, not *Lordship*; and conceive *Lordship* to be inconsistent with any of Christs Ministers: And judicious English men conceive, *Englands Bishops* lost their *Lordships*, when thrust out of the House of Peers, by the Statue 17° *Caroli*. And when the Bishop of *Rochester* in *England*, and *Waterford* in *Ireland*, were, for their misdemeanours and fellonies, tried at the *Commons Bar* by twelve plain Country men as their Peers, their Lordships appeared more titular then reall, little to be gloried in: Observing you to be *Bishop of Exeter*, I cannot but enquire, whether the defence of *Englands Liturgy*, be the part imposed on the Bishops of that Sea, to be managed by Rhetorick (as their essential property) more then strength of Reason? which, I find to have been acted by your late Predecessour, to as little purpose as now by you. But it may be this was your Lordships Harbinger, to direct your Clergy how to receive your Grace; They hereby may learn better to salute you, then subject to you.

Bishop Hall *his Remonstrance and defence against* Smectymnuus.

Imprudent Commenting on his Majesties Declaration. Page 1, 2, 3, 4.

What Prudence, Piety, or Loyalty, led you to presume and publish a Comment on *His Majesties Royal Declaration*, forcing on it a sence not expressed? as if you would stir up in people a jealousie of fallacy in those gracious provisions for his Subjects Liberty; and to suggest to the world, the order of solemn and publick worship, practised in his Majesties Royal Chappel, and Family, and intended for his Dominions, to be different from what all the world knoweth his Sacred Majesty hath solemnly sworn to God it should be? It hath been charged on Lord Bishops, and seems

seems to be essential to their Lordships, to make bold Comments on, and conjectures of Kings Declarations, and to maintain bold contests against them: Do you look for *Cham*'s blessing? or shame you not to discover the nakedness of your Father?

What charity or ingenuity led you to brand all, *with peevishness, ingratitude, and schismatical petulancie and pride*, who do not presently take up the use of the *Common-prayer Book*, whilst the Conscience of some, scrupulous of the best things in it, (as to their order, fitness, or fulness of what ye intend;) and the prudence of others, expecting the alteration promised in his Majesties Declaration, doth supersede the act, which their desire of the peace, unity, and uniformity of the Church doth incline them unto? Or with what sobriety do you adventure to censure the Directory for worship, *as useless, supposititious, and illegitimate*, which was *digested* by an Assembly of Divines, for number, learning, gravity, and piety, beyond the censure of any single Prelate consecrated, much more Lord Elect; *approved and authorized* by the judicious debate, and deliberate determination, and Ordinance of both Houses of Parliament, and by the *assent* of his most Sacred Majesty to all Ordinances of that Parliament (then supposed to be in being) injoyning the same, signifyed by solemn Oath, sufficient to strike a dread in a whole Convocation, that ye should not dare, for fear of a Premunire, to judge it *supposititious, or illegitimate*? Is no regard due to the authority of Lords and Commons assembled in Parliament? Nor reverence to his Majesties Oath, wherein he hath sworn *to use this Directory in his Family, to maintain it in* Scotland, *and to indeavour to establish it in his other Dominions*? Is *Sarcasmus* the only figure which must make your Lordship significant? A lofty, controuling spirit hath ever attended, and still seems to be essential to *Englands* Prelacy, but is no way suitable to the meekness of the Lord Christ (our only Arch-Bishop) or of our gra-

Intemperate Censures. Page 5.

Page 6.

His Majesties Coronation Oath at Scoon *in* Scotland.

cious

cious King, expreſſed in his late Royall Indulgence.

Confuſion by generality of expreſſion.

Deal you not very clearly and candidly with your Reader, to preſent him with an Encomium of *Liturgy*, without any explication of the term? know you not that it is a Greek term? or think you all Engliſh men to underſtand Greek? or is it not uſed variouſly, and to ſignifie different things? as ſometimes *any prieſtly office*, ſometimes all *miniſterial acts*, ſometimes *ſinging of Pſalmes*, and ſometimes *prayer*, as *Smectymnuus* out of *Balſamon*, *Zonaras*, *Dionyſius*, *Iſidore*, and *Chryſoſtome* note: Liturgie of old ſignified only a *directive order* of praying, reading, expounding Scriptures, and adminiſtration of Sacraments; and ſuch Liturgies *Juſtin Martyr* and *Tertullian* in their Apollogies do give us an account of; And it is of later uſage referred to ſignifie *preſcribed and impoſed formes of worſhip*.

Defence of answer to the Remonſtrance. Page 28, 29.

In the firſt, known, and beſt ſence, the *Directory* (you deſpiſe) hath the exact form of a Liturgie, and may merit much of your applauſe, better then the form you ſeem to apply it unto.

In which ſence would you have your Reader underſtand it? Hath not Mr. *Crofton* in his *Analepſis* ſufficiently detected your danger, and the inefficacy of your writings, in darkening the object by ſuch general termes undiſtinguiſhed, or unexplained? But it may be it is as much below your Grace to take his admonition, as above your ability to anſwer his Arguments: Or muſt your Rhetorick repreſent you to the world to be an *Heraclitus* ὀκοτεινος reſolving *obſcura per obſcuriora*, pleaſing the ear with a *vox & preterea nihil*, and catching the fancy with a fair ſhew, of what the mind cannot find, and making men know you have the Art of ſpeaking, though not of informing, or convincing; and juſtifying the ſalutation of your late Anonymous Antagoniſt, Wordie Doctor.

Croftons St. Peters bonds abide Page 2, 3, 4.

The Anatomy of Dr. Gaudens Non-ſence and Blaſphemy Page 2.

Do you not in a rhetorical flouriſh ſtrangely hyperbolize, when you (underſtanding by Liturgie the ſet formes

of

of publick solemn worship, as you seem to do through your book, and must understand when you speak *de specie* of the late Liturgie of *England*) say, That *Liturgie is the most excellent meanes to preserve the truth of Christian and reformed Religion, it is necessary for the holy harmony and sweet communion of all Christians, mightily conduceth to the edification and salvation of the meaner sort of people; the Christian Religion cannot easily be planted, or thrive, among the country or common people, without a settled constant Liturgy imposed and used; nor can the reformed part of Religion be preserved in* England, *to any flourishing degree, without the Liturgy be maintained, as the firm and most impregnable bulwark against Romish superstition; upon the Liturgy depends the peace and unity of this Church, as much as the house did on its pillars which* Sampson *pulled down; The Liturgy is the only bond of Loyalty, love and duty to soveraign Majesty; The Liturgy is the only basis of glory, charity, unity, safety, reformation and true Religion; that in the variation of the Liturgy* England *must shake hands with, and bid farewell to all these. It unites all honest minds, includes all our common necessities, craves all spiritual and temporal supplies, keeps Christians warm in their love to God, in loyalty to their King, & in their charity to each other: It daily propounds the summary of all necessary Religion, it layes and confirmes in the minds of the meanest people, the foundations of sound faith, and saving knowledge, according to Gods Word; it is so compleat for duties to be done, graces to be obtained, mercies to be enjoyed, both here and hereafter, that I doubt not to affirm this truth of the Liturgy, that if the common sort of people duly attend it, judiciously learn it, and conscientiously live up to the duties and graces there proposed to them (of which Ministers particular Prayers and Sermons, are but either commentaries, or repetitions, or paraphrases) there is no doubt but they shall please God, and be well prepared for an happy death, and blessed eternity.* I must desire you to consider and resolve us, whether the meanes

Horrid hyperbolical applause of the Liturgie. Page 10, 11, 12.

Page 42, 43.

of.

of edification be not the ſame to the *greater ſort of people* and *well-bred Chriſtians* and Courtiers, that it is to the meaner, country, and common ſort of people? or whether Religion be like civil faſhions, of one cut at Court, and another in Country, that you lay ſuch ſtreſſe on this diſtinction of *Country and well-bred Chriſtians*? Nature knows no difference of ſouls, but edification is the ſame to theſe beings, and God is no reſpecter of perſons, ſalvation is to the poor the ſame in diſpenſation as to the Prince. Again, if Liturgy, preſcribed formes of prayer, impoſed by Authority, be ſo eſſential to the planting and preſerving of the Chriſtian Religion, I wonder why Chriſt (the Wiſdom of the Father) and his Apoſtles (immediately inſpired) did not digeſt, and preſcribe, and by his Regal, and their Apoſtolical authority, impoſe a Liturgy on all Nations, and Chriſtian Churches, and how they planted the Chriſtian Religion without it? Chriſt taught his Apoſtles to pray, but that he tied them to that prayer none affirm, or that he impoſed any Liturgy doth not appear, nor was ever pretended: Jewiſh Rabbines do affirm, that from *Moſes* to *Ezra*, which was above a thouſand years, there were no ſtinted formes of prayer heard of in the Jewiſh Church; but every man prayed according to his ability: And it is apparent, that for full three hundred years after Chriſt, the Chriſtian Church knew no ſet forms of prayer, and all their Liturgy was *a directive rubrick*; and when ſet formes were injoyned on the account of the *Arrian* and *Pelagian* errors, they were of the Miniſters own compoſing, not of the Churches impoſing and preſcription. I muſt indeed confeſs, when *Auſtin* the Popes Apoſtle came to plant or propagate the Chriſtian Religion, he would needs impoſe on the Brittains *Romes Liturgy*, and did enforce it by the ſword: But *Eleutherius* preſcribed none to King *Lucius*, when he deſired directions in reference to the worſhip of God and order of the Church in this Kingdome.

Muſt

Must we imagine your Lordship wiser then Christ and his Apostles, to discover a means of *planting and preserving Christian Religion*, that they never directed? Or think you, that they were not faithful in the Lords House, but that their dictates need a supply of Papal injunctions, and Prelatical prescriptions? Was not the Church planted and preserved against the power of Paganisme, when the Christians prayed *without the dictates of a Monitor*, which the Heathen used? Stood they not three hundred years without any prescribed formes? Are not the reformed Churches, who impose no formes of publick worship, true Churches of Christ? How then can you make *Liturgy*, in your sense, *the basis of the Church, like the pillars of the house which* Sampson *pulled down?* None but Papists, and popishly affected Bishops, will make set formes of prayer and administration of the *esse* of the Church, and only basis of peace, and unity of Church and State, without which it cannot subsist.

I confess harmony and communion in the Church is a necessary ornament; I expect the Church of Christ to be of one mind and mouth, to think and speak the same things, but much question, whether it must be articulate in the words and syllables of the English Liturgy, which if you speak but the due praise of, it must be extended throughout the Catholick Church. Is the reading of a Liturgy the *unum necessarium* of the Ministry? You attribute to it the efficacy of catechising and preaching, and make it the all in all to edification, and mean mens salvation: No marvel that our late pious, prudent Bishops made way for it, by silencing and suspending diligent Preachers, and studious Catechists: The foolishness of preaching, and vanity of catechising, will sure be shortly contracted in *Exeter* Dioceſs, where it hath much abounded, that the all-edifying-Common-prayer book may be extended: For in your apprehension of the benefit of our Liturgy, preaching, confessions of faith, and catechising, seem to be of no use; the end of them being pursued and

effected by the Liturgy, it muſt needs be the ſupplement of them all?

If, Sir, the Service-book of *England* be ſuch a *firm and impregnable bulwark againſt Romiſh ſuperſtition*, as you ſuppoſe and ſay, how came King *Edward* to appeaſe his *Devonſhire* Rebels by aſſuring them that it was the Maſſe in Engliſh: His words in his meſſage ſent unto them were theſe; *viz.*

Fox his Acts and Monum. Page 1189.

As for the Service in the Engliſh tongue, it perchance ſeemeth to you a new Service, *and indeed is no other then the old, the ſelf-ſame words in Engliſh that were in Latine; if the Service of the* Church *were good in Latine, it remaineth good in Engliſh, for nothing is altered.*

How could it anſwer the ſcope and end of compaſſing it in this form and order, (expunging in Queen *Elizabeths* book what might have been a fence againſt Romiſh ſuperſtition, (*viz. From the Pope of* Rome *and his deteſtable enormities, Good Lord deliver us*; which was inſerted into King *Edwards*) which was to bring the Papiſts to the Church, wherein it ſucceeded, ſaith Sir *Edward Cook*, *For that all came to* Church, *and for eleven yeares of this Queens reign they knew no Recuſants*; Not through any converting power of the Service-book, but the rigour of the Law, and identity of the Service to their Maſſe (if but in Latine) which was ſo far from being a bulwark againſt Popery, that the Pope offered Queen *Elizabeth* to eſtabliſh the ſame, if ſhe would admit his Supremacy, well knowing, that an *Engliſh Maſſe* will as little ſhake as a *Latine Maſſe* will ſupport his Kingdome; for the change of language is no very impregnable bulwark againſt any Religion. Suppoſe a ſubtle Jeſuit aſſault a ſimple Proteſtant, brought up under your Liturgie, with this plea, *You deal ſinfully to ſeparate from the* Church *of* Rome, *from her you received your Religion, and you retain her ſervice whilſt you ſeem to forſake her fellowſhip, for your Service is wholly taken out of hers, and hers is not taken out of yours, by which it is evi-*

dent

dent she is the true and ancient Church. I pray, Sir, what argument will your Liturgy furnish him withall, whereby to answer, or oppose, and avoid the assault? Is it not then a very impregnable bulwark, that affords no repulse? May not Papists joyn with you in your Liturgy, and yet their popish Principles live in them? How come the Papists, observing the suppression of Preachers and enforcement of the Service-book, to boast openly, that *England was posting towards Rome*, and the difference grew little between an English Protestant and a Papist: I wish we find not too soon Romish Superstitions made consistent with our English Liturgy.

Sir, I might enlarge this Expostulation, by demanding how ignorance and prophaneness spread and flourished under the Service-book, affectionately contended for by the roaring Roisters of all Countries, as its prime Champions? How commotions, perturbations, schismes, seditions, rebellions, conspiracies and plots have grown up under the strict imposing and general use of the Liturgy, at *Franckford* in *Germany*, in *England*, and other places, if it were such an edifying, informing, establishing, quieting, composing, soul-saving instrument; but I must not enlarge.

But Sir, give me leave to advise you to re-assume this *Encomium*, and on second thoughts to consider, whether it fall one doit below *idolizing the Liturgy*, whilst it is not only put in the place of preaching and catechising, express Ordinances of God, but advanced into a parity, if not preheminence to the Scripture; that efficacy being attributed to the reading and hearing the Liturgy read, which is not yeilded to the reading and hearing of the Scriptures read, which if it be real, will turn all our Bibles into Common-prayer Books, and justly plead for a reading, non-preaching Ministry, and defend the presumptious and joyful acclamations of the rude and prophane, as having done all devotion when they have heard divine Service

read, and country Curates, in the hyperbolical out-cry, *That the wit of men and Angels cannot mend the* Service-book. Seriously, Sir, I must tell you, your high applause hath deaded my affection to the Liturgy, and established me in the objection *ab incommodo* urged against it, (which I was not willing to admit) being now convinced, that the Liturgy (not of absolute necessity) like *Hezekiahs* Serpent, is apparently idolized, and to be utterly abolished: The Scripture can dictate a form of publick, solemn worship, without the help of the Romish Breviary or Missals. You are, Sir, looked on as a non-conforming Bishop, and known to be a covenanted-Presbyter; this applause of the Service-book sounds not well from any, worst from you; confess it freely: Travellers and Historians may be allowed to over-reach, and Oratours to Hyperbolize; it is an easie matter for a Rhetorician to retract, with a *Contra quam sentit solet ironia jocari*: You cannot on second thoughts speak these things in good earnest, yet you may as warrantably extol your Liturgy, as extenuate extemporary and self composed prayers, *As rude, barren, superficial, defective, and deform, in matter, and in manner, in judgement, and expresse, flat, dull, and indevout, tedious and confused, in the ablest and best of Ministers, by their indispositions and indiscretions, in which, the variety of expressions are in prayer or Sacraments, to the meaner sort, much at one as Latine Service.* I will not deny but extemporary prayer by particular Ministers may be subject to inconveniencies, as (*omnis commoditas sua fert incommoda secum*) other good things are; but they spring not from the nature of the things, which you must confess to be good, and a duty, and therefore you assign it *to the pulpit*, which certainly should have, as serious, orderly, composed, devout, and fervent performance as the *Desk*; but from the weakness, ignorance, precipitancy, rashness, and regardlesness of the persons, who are no less prepostrous, rude, and reproachful, in chopping and canting their common prayers, being illite-

The debasing of extemporary Prayer.
Page 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11.

rate

rate and prophane men, carelesly admitted into the ministry; and therefore is of no force to the debasing of the method, which nature dictateth, and the God of nature directeth; the mind being the best Monitour in our addresses to God, the mouth speaking out of the abundance of the heart. Though, Sir, I deny not set formes of prayer to be lawful; yet had they been necessary as you suggest, I wonder the Lord did not dictate them by his Spirit: Nothing that is meerly humane being of such efficacy and necessity, as you make your Liturgy, but being abused, may, and must be removed: It is apparent, that prayer, as propheſie, was extemporary in the Church at *Corinth*, and the Apostle directs it to be done in a known tongue, but never did inhibit or restrain it; surely he judged it not to be *much at one with Latine Service*: Doth your Common-Prayer-book carry a Dictionary along with it? Or must all go to School to learn their *double Psalter* before it can be so profitable? Or cannot English people understand plain English (their native language) as soon as it is uttered? Nothing but madness could make this comparison, it is as forcible against preaching, and all common discourse as prayer; certainly the God of prayer knoweth the power, and profit of the gift of prayer to his people, which he never couched nor confined, but quickened and provoked by prescribed formes, which should rather be patternes for imitation, then prayers only subject to repetition.

The vanity of his reason against the alteration of the Liturgy.

Doe you not by very profound Arguments withstand the *alteration and abrogation* of your Service-book? which being weighed, amount to as much as your late reasons against the obliging power of the *solemn League and Covenant*, and will be alike effectual: You plead against it, *That such a change may not in piety or policy be admitted*: But your policy, like *Pharaohs* lean Kine, eats up your piety, that it propounds not one true proposition that should bar this change: your particular plea is, first,

It

Page 3. *It would much reproach the wisdome, and blemish the piety of the first martyrly composers; and secondly, impudently disparage the judgement and devotion of the whole Church of* England, *its Princes, Parliaments and Ministers:* both which in my eye are one and the same, though by you divided; and before they can prevail, you must clear it by good proof (for your volubility of speech stayes our credence, knowing that many words cannot be without sin) you must tell us who were the *Martyrly Composers of your Liturgy*, and that for such composition they were *martyred*, I think you will find none before Arch-bishop *Laud*, and he was Composer of the Scotch, not English Liturgy: I believe, that you will on enquiry find, that *Romes* Popes were the Composers of all the parts of our Liturgy, and did one after another bring a faggot to this pile, yet never burned in defence of it: May I make bold to commend to your reading the book called, *A Parrallel between the Liturgy and the Masse*, written by *R. B.* It will point you to the Composers, by appropriating each part to the Pope, who was its Patron: What was the work of our Composers, but to make the Latine Service speak English? If King *Edward* may be believed, who knew the first Composers as well as you? I thought, Sir, you could have differenced between *translation* and *composition*; it hath been craved and contended for ever since our first reformation, that the English Church would lay aside the Roman Liturgy, and according to *Eleutherius* his advice to King *Lucius*, digest a form and order of worship for it self, according to, and derived from the Scriptures, but could never yet be effected, it being apparent that this liberty would effect a true ancient Liturgy, our late *Directory*, or some such like. Yet Sir, suppose you had found the first Composers to have been Martyrs, could not the Service be altered, yea abrogated, without an *impeachment of their wisdom and piety*, or *impudent disparagement of the Judgement of Church or State*? Are the decrees of good men laws of the *Medes*

and

and *Perſians* ? Is that Rule of no uſe,

Tempora mutantur, & nos mutamur ab illis ?

Is infancy and adult age all alike ? Can we not *Nuces relinquere* in the matters of reformation, without impeachment of piety ? What diſparagement was it to the Apoſtles, that the Church did abandon the *puerilia* of Jewiſh Ceremonies, which they did indulge with the countenance of Apoſtolical Canons, in the infancy of Chriſtianity ? Was not this Argument of more force againſt the firſt reformation, then the growth and proceſs thereof ? Muſt a preſent prudent retention of *ineptias* to pleaſe fools and Children, until better grown, be a bar to the after rejection of them ? This wrangling for your Pſalter will provoke the taking of it away by force ; God your Father heareth your childiſh cry.

You tell us *many Non-conformiſts* uſed it ; it is true, but defended it not, nor delighted in it : They indeed denied it to be a ſufficient ground of ſeparation, but deemed it a grand corruption ; they condeſcended to uſe it, but contended againſt it, and pray'd the alteration, if not abrogation of it.

And as the Reformation grew in ſtrength, the ſtomacks of ſerious Non-conformiſts did more and more nauſeate the Service-book, and at length thty did *viriliter* ſtand againſt it, and generally ſuffered by refuſal to give conſent unto it ; witneſs the *Lincolnſhire Miniſters*, and the many in your Lordſhips Dioceſs in *Devonſhire* and *Cornwall*, whoſe reaſons for non-ſubſcriptions will check your obſervation of their complyance.

And now Sir, you muſt know the *ſolemn League and Covenant* hath paſt upon our King and Kingdome, and bound againſt this form of worſhip, as neither conform *to the Word of God*, nor *example* of (any reformed, much leſſe) the beſt Reformed Churches ; ſo that what could before,

cannot

cannot now be admitted without palpable perjury. Let all your conſiderations for the Liturgy be caſt into the ballance, and only the Kings Oath for the uſe and eſtabliſhment of the Directory (though that alſo is made exceeding ponderous by the National Covenant for Reformation) be oppoſed, and they will appear as duſt in the ſcale, a *Mene Tekel Upharſin*: Are not you, a known Covenanter, aſhamed to be the grand Inſtigator, and loud Trumpet to God-provoking, Land-deſtroying-perjury? For ſhame releaſe St. *Peter*, before you contend for an Engliſh Maſſe to be retained, and enforced by authority.

Sir, with what ſerioufneſs could you affirm, That *a good proteſtant, and worthy Miniſters have no greater objection againſt the Liturgy, then this, that he fancies that he could in ſome words and phraſes mend it, or put ſome aliaſſes to it*, and ſo take it for granted, that *the defects and faults of your Service-book are but verbal, and therefore venial in things of humane conſtitution.* Sir, ſhall I imagine that you have never ſeen, nor heard of the *Lincolnſhire Reaſons againſt the Liturgy*, or have over-looked the *Reaſons for non-ſubſcription to the Service-book*, and defence of the ſame by the Miniſters of your own Dioceſs of *Devonſhire* and *Cornwall*? Or have you not regarded the Exceptions to the Liturgy by Mr. *Crofton*, your preſent Antagoniſt, in his late faſtening St. *Peters* Fetters? Every of theſe would have informed you, that the conteſts of the Non-conformiſts of old, or Covenanters of late, is not a ſtrife of words, but about things, they excepting againſt the method, frame and order of the Service-book, as neither full nor fitting, no way pertinent to publick, ſolemn worſhip, by reaſon of the deficiency of prayers for divine aſſiſtance in ſacred duties, by reaſon of the rude abruptions, verſicles, popular reſponds, alterations of geſture in the ſame duty (as ſtanding and ſitting at reading the ſame Scripture, mutation of place and geſture in prayer) condemned by the firſt propoſers of this form, and ſober, judicious Papiſts, as well as by

theſe men: by reaſon of the rejection of Canonical Scripture, and obtruſion of fabulous and fallacious pieces of Apocripha, and in great meaſure adding to, and abſtracting from the Word of God, and altering the very mind of the Holy Ghoſt by a moſt falſe tranſlation annexed to and impoſed with this book: And by reaſon of the redundancy of holy-day ſervice, a full formal ſuperſtition, the very foundation thereof (*viz.*) *the ſanctity of the dayes*) being an iniquity without any juſt or regular authority, the Church being no way commiſſioned thereunto, nor yet to impoſe ſignificant and edifying Ceremonies in divine worſhip, which in this book abound.

All theſe, Sir, will appear real, not verbal defects, faults, and redundancies to any that do not by a rhetorical Chymiſtry reſolve all things into fancy, as more willing to ſpeak then know. Sir, compoſe your ſpirit, and take a ſecond ſurveigh of your Service-book, and ſee whether your Scriptures, which you ſay you have prepared, will obviate theſe and the like exceptions, which if they will do, the Nonconformiſt, as well as the Conformiſt, will ſing to you, with an *Eris mihi magnus Apollo*, It having been never done, nor yet attempted by any, and until it be done. If Mr. *Baxter* hath (as you ſay he hath, but I cannot believe) profeſſed, *That he ſaw nothing in the Liturgy, which might not well bear a good conſtruction, if men looked upon it as became Chriſtians, with an eye of charity*, we muſt queſtion his *juſtice and ingenuity*, who know his aim and endeavours, were profeſſed to be, to make and obtain ſuch an alteration of the Service as might (according to the rule in Philoſophy, whilſt *generatio unius* prove *corruptio alterius*) and make a ſpecifical change of Liturgy, as well as of Epiſcopacy, wherein if temptation ſhould (as I hope it will not) divert him, you muſt know we reverence the man, but cannot *Jurare in verba magiſtri*, and reſign our judgement to his *ſay ſo*: But I rather believe you miſapply Mr. *Baxters* ſpeech, he might ſpeak it of the matter, Page 33.

and particular paſſages, which charity may underſtand in a good ſence, but not of the form, frame, order, method, whereby it exiſts as a Liturgy and publick Service-Book, wherein we are confident it muſt be corrected, and amended, before it receive Mr. *Baxters* atteſtation; and moſt men know the miſtake of the *ratio formalis objecti* is as mutual to Dr. *Ganden*, as his Rhetorick.

Do you not with much honour and honeſty take upon you the defence of *a lye*, which that you might the better do, you ſeem to me to begin with a double lye? Firſt, that
Page 24, 25. *ſome ſay the Church begins her devotion with a lye*, which is not ſaid by any I know of; you ſhould have named your *one Miniſter*, whom you know to have ſaid ſo: I know indeed many that have ſaid, the book of Common-prayer begins its directions with a *lie*, denominating *a ſentence of Scripture*, which is not found in the Bible, but this is not beginning devotion, the matter may be true, and the denomination of it, a ſentence of Scripture, a lie.

Secondly, That *the compoſers of the Liturgy did not cite the place in the figured margin, to ſhew the literall ſameneſs of the words, but evangelical ſoundneſs of that ſentence*, (viz.) At what time ſoever a ſinner doth repent him of his ſin from the bottom of his heart, I will put away all his wickedneſs out of my remembrance, ſaith the Lord; and yet, let a ſerious Reader obſerve, and ſearch, and in a Service-book-verſion, you ſhall find, every of its companions have their texts in the figured margin, noting the *literal ſameneſs of the words*, and *dignoſcitur ſociis &c.* What doth it in the van of theſe Scriptures, in the ſame rank and file, if not intended to be received as of the ſame quality? And again, how can we underſtand their mind better, then by their rubrick denominating, and directing *theſe following ſentences*, as ſo many ſentences of Scripture? Is not ſpeech the interpreter of the mind as well by the pen as tongue? And what ſpeech can be more plain then this? *The Prieſt ſhall read one of theſe ſentences of Scripture which follow*;

Let

Let a Grammarian tell you what is the Antecedent to this Relative *these*, will he not soon resolve, *sentences which follow*? And let a Logician resolve what is it that is predicated in this phrase, *which follow*, and he will resolve, *the sentences which are immediately sub-joyned* with the texts of Scripture in the margin; and then you must need conclude, that the *sentences which follow* are *sentences of scripture*, and the *scriptures figured in the margin* are to shew the *literal sameness*, *not evangelical soundness*, and that the rubrick doth plainly predicate, the sentences which follow to be sentences of scripture. Sir, you must conjure up from the dead, more then one of the composers of this book, to bear witness in this case, before you convince men of the verity of a Comment, contrary to the grammatical construction, and logical resolution of the words spoken and written by them when alive.

And now Sir, I well see not, how you will acquit the directive rubrick from beginning the Service-book with a palpable falshood, though the Churches devotion begin not with a lye: Your joynt *suffrage of scripture unto the sence*, will not maintain these articulate words to be a *sentence of scripture*: When I preach, I hope I preach nothing but scripture sence, and yet I should be called *lyar* on both sides mine head, if I should dare to say I preached nothing but scripture sentences: If I should transcribe a piece of Dr. Burgesses, *No sacriledge to buy Bishops Lands*, and say it was a sentence of Dr. Gauden's *sighs and teares of the Church of England*, would you not charge me with a lye, or false quotation, and fathering on you what you never spake, and though I should tell you, and by multiplied instances demonstrate it was *your sence*, yet you would stand to it that it was a lie, because I said it was *your sentence*. Sir, take heed, you know the place that is provided for such as *make and love a lie*: Defence is no mean evidence of affection: Let me tell your Reverence, you have here stept beyond your boldest Predecessour, for Dr. *Boyes* chose rather

to take it for granted, then to dispute it, knowing that debates do detect falshood, and therefore begins his Exposition of the Service-book answerable to the Liturgy it self, (viz.) *All these Texts of holy writ premised*: So that these *sentences of scripture* in the text, are, these *texts of scripture* in the Comment: And when *Laud* and his late Reformers did digest the Liturgy of *England* for the Church of *Scotland*, this notorious falshood did so stare them in the face, as obvious to every vulgar Reader, that it engaged them to expunge this whole sentence, and insert a real, literal sentence of scripture into the room of it. Sir, when you manage a second plea for this lie, take some pains to acquit the preface of your book, from that palpable falshood, (viz.) *Nothing is hereby ordained to be read, but the pure Word of God, the holy Scriptures, or that which is evidently grounded on the same*, yet much Apocripha false and fabulous is appointed to be read, whereat many serious sober men do stumble.

His judicious, new Notions in divinity.

Page 19.

Lastly, I cannot but observe how judiciously you start new notions in divinity unto the defence of your Liturgy, whilst you are no mean pretender to antiquity; yet I must give you your due, and confess you run the Ceremonies, and your Liturgy, but a thousand years, and so keep at a sufficient distance from the pure and primitive times of the Church, which used a directive rubrick, rather then any set, prescribed, and imposed Liturgy: I will presume, you well know the man of sin was revealed, and superstition spread it self very far in the Church of Christ in the space of six hundred years after Christ, though you over-boldly affirm, the Church then knew nothing of Papal usurpation, or Romish superstition, wherein you cannot but know that history contradicts you: As to what you suggest of solemn, devout, and pathetical Liturgies, used from the first Centuries, I passe it as a Rhetorical flourish until they be produced, which will be *ad græcas Calendas*.

Your

Your notions that you ſtart in this defence, are they that I amazedly behold ; As,

1. *The Lords Prayer ought to be repeated in every diſtinct ſervice, and no conſecration of any Sacrament can be thought compleat, and duly performed, unleſſe this moſt perfect prayer, be added to the words of inſtitution.* I hope Sir, the ſanctity of the words and ſyllables in the Lords Prayer, is not become a Principle unto Proteſtants, nor that our devotion muſt be meaſured by the number of our Pater-noſters: That Chriſt appoynted this forme as a prayer, I deny not, but as the only prayer, or complement of every duty, I ſee not, nor dare beleeve, for I find no ground in the practice of Chriſt, or his Apoſtles for it. St. *Paul* delivered unto the Church what he received from Chriſt, unto the full conſecration of the Lords Supper, yet no ſuch charge concerning the Lords Prayer, yet certainly he received all things neceſſary to the compleat and due performance of every Sacrament: The Lords Prayer may be loved and uſed, but muſt not be idolized, and made neceſſary to every act of devotion, your ſuppoſed Antiquity for this notion muſt be proved, and then vaile to verity. Page 8. 20.

2. That theſe words (*viz.*) *Receive* thou the holy Ghoſt, *&c. Are the authoritative and commiſſionating words eſſentiall to miniſteriall Ordination:* If ſo, how ſhall they be divided from thoſe words, *all power is given me in heaven and in earth*, which did accompany and enforce them? or from the act of *breathing* whereby they became effectuall? I have heard indeed that Biſhop *Pierce* in his Ordination doth breath on the Miniſters over whom he pronounceth theſe words; and to what end then doth our Church annex, *a take thou power to preach the Goſpell*, &c. I hope you Biſhops will not pretend to imitate Chriſt, in his double act in his Miſſion of his Apoſtles; that of *Communication* and immediate indowmenr, or infuſion of qualification performed in that forme of words, viz. *Receive you the Holy Ghoſt*, and by Page 20.

that

that action, (viz.) he breathed on them. And that of *Commission and Authorization* in those words *Goe teach all Nations baptising them, &c.* Which the two different speeches of Bishops in Ordination do seeme to suggest; If so, I must confesse Bishops will be found essentiall to Ordination, and you have found a ready way, to pronounce a nullity of the Ordination of all men, ordained of late, not only by Presbiters, but by all the reformed Churches, none of them you may assuredly know having ever presumed to use these communicative words who can conveigh nothing by them.

Your next notions do relate unto the *Sacrament of Baptisme*; In reference unto which you proudly *boast*, of the efficacy of your Liturgy, against the errors conversant about this Ordinance, and say, *That it very potently, and fully vindicates the pristine honour and Catholick use, of infant Baptisme against the Anabaptisticall novelty, and Catabaptisticall perversenesse*: Truly, I doe believe, Infant Baptisme to be of *pristine Use and Catholick Honour*, and have in my place appeared against the *Anabaptisticall Novelty, and Catabaptisticall perversenesse*; but could never yet find, and now want your eyes to see, how your Service-Book doth any way vindicate the same: I pray in what termes lieth the *fullnesse and potency* of this vindication? your Book doth indeed direct Ministers to Baptise Infants, but, (with reverence may I note it) in such terms and manner, as may suggest, the baptising of Infants to have been derived from *Rome*, since her Apostacy and Superstition, rather then to have been, of *pristine honour, and catholick use*, denominating the administratour *Priest*, a plaine Roman terme, depending on the Altar on which he attendeth, and the supposed Sacrifice (not Sacrament) which he offereth: And suggesting it so necessary, as if with Papists you determined, *salvation not attainable by infants without Baptisme*; and therefore it directs an hasty, disorderly, prepostrous administration of baptisme, in private,

Page 12.

with-

without the ſolemnity befitting ſo ſacred an Ordinance, and ſo important a buſineſſe, as is, *ingraffing into Chriſt, and incorporation* into the Church, for which it produceth the plaine Popiſh reaſon, neceſſity, *when great need ſhall compell them*; which neceſſity, is ſuppoſed to be ſo great, that invocation of a bleſſing on the Sacrament, prayer to the ſanctification of the Element, is allowed, to be omitted, and the bare pronunciation of the words, I baptize thee, in the name of Father, Sonne, and holy Ghoſt, is made ſufficient to the Sacrament; what neceſſity, can we ſuppoſe this to be, if not that of the Papiſts, that *whatever excuſe be pleadable, the unbaptiſed periſh*: And then your Service-Book doth ſuggeſt infant baptiſme to be of *no catholick uſe* other then in a Romiſh ſence, who affect to be called the Catholick Church.

Againe, ſo far is your Service-book, from any *potent, and full vindication of Infant baptiſme*, that were I minded to appear an Antipedobaptiſt, I would urge no weak argument from your own book, againſt this honourable practiſe, and that thus, According to your Service book, you exclude *federall*, and baptize on *perſonall holineſſe*, by a perſonall profeſſion of faith, and promiſe of obedience; and it ſo far explodes federall ſanctity, *the only foundation and very baſis of Infant baptiſme*, that it takes no cogniſance of the parents, or their intereſt in the Covenant; in purſuance of which your Canons 1603 provide, *That no Parent ſhall be urged to be preſent or be admitted to anſwer as godfather for his own child*: Canon 29.
It is indeed true, your book directs this profeſſion to be made by others *Godfathers and Godmothers*, but theſe two things are obſervable; That they do it by a ſuppoſed deputation, (for which you have need to produce a very clear commiſſion) And they profeſſe and promiſe in the name of the party baptized, not of themſelves, ſo that *perſonall holineſſe*, is by your book *the baſis and proper ground of baptiſme*, which if nature admit not, and Scripture approynt not to be done by a deputy, *Godfather, or Godmother*, will it not

not follow? *That the Catholick practise hath been to baptise persons when at yeares of discretion, to answer, and stipulate for themselves.* Sir, if I were to deale with Dr. *Mayer*, although I could consent to *Zanchy* his *Com-patres*, on the reasons he urgeth (so far as civilities may mingle with Gods sacred Ordinances,) yet I must have withstood *Englands* Godfathers, as not understanding, or favouring the terme, and as exclusive to the Parent, and subverting the very reason which must direct me as a Minister, to apply baptisme, to its infant subject.

Mayer *his Commentary on the Chatechise in the Common-prayer Book.* Page 4. Zanch. in Ephes. page 580.

And now Sir, what is become of the fullnesse, and potency of your Service book Vindication of the pristine honour, and Catholick use of Infant Baptisme: I thank God, I am no Anabaptist to improve this Argument against the Church of England.

From this Bravadoe of the potency of your Liturgy against errour, you passe into a discourse about *baptismall Regeneration*, and undertake the explication and defence of *the service-book* sence, and expression, wherein Sir, you have approved your self a better Oratour, then Logician, or Divine, and in your Rhetorick, you shew your self singularly well skill'd in *Ænigma*, which is, *obscuris tecta sententia verbis*, for what you would explaine, you have no little darkened, by new coyned distinctions, and strange assertions, as, *active, and passive Regeneration*; *and Regeneration removing the guilt and punishment, not power of sin*; *full and proper Regeneration, will, and will not save*, and the like; all which call for a Comment, we not knowing your distinctions, deeming Regeneration to be ever passive, *ratione subjecti*, unlesse you dreame, of the salvation of *Plato*, *Aristotle*, and *Seneca*, and according to the rule of the last, affirme, *licet nobis nasci quicquid volumus*: Sure I am, in the work of Regeneration, we are no more active then in our naturall generation, *not being able to think a good thought, God working in us, to will and to doe of his good pleasure:* Nor understand I, that Regeneration doth formally exist in *a release of the guilt,*

guilt, and penalty, of originall sin, which I ever judged to be the formallity of *Justification*, and a release from *the power of sin* to be the formallity of *Regeneration*: Nor Sir, do you any way deliver an heaven-born child from death, *by totall and finall Apostacy*, which is the only objection, you undertake to salve, whilst you affirme, *that full, and proper Regeneration, will not save, but may be smouthered, by actuall and presumptuous sins*: What Schoolmen afforded you your distinctions? or Fathers, and common places your divinity? I suppose, round systems, are not of account with you, any more then our late Bishops, who endeavoured to sink them; you should have named them, unlesse you will take the Chaire, and become a Teacher of new notions, and leader of a new Sect: Truly Sir, whilst you attempt the vindication of baptismall Regeneration, you seeme to me to have stumbled into many notions, which may be better censured, and called heresie, then Aerius principle of the parity of Bishops, and Presbirers, these having been condemned, by many grave and judicious Divines, assembled in the Synod of *Dort*, as well, as the scope and current of all Divinity, and that by one only *Epiphanius*. Particularly you suggest

First, *The sinfull estate of infants, is only an estate of guilt, and that by imputation, unto the taking away of which, baptismall Regeneration doth suffice, and so fits them for heaven*: What think you Sir, is there no power of sin, pravity, Anomy, or Ataxie, naturally inherent in infants? I pray tell us, what that is, which Divines call, *peccatum originale originatum*, and that distinct from *peccatum originale originans*? and what is that the Heathens complain'd of? as *Plato*, *Homines natura sua esse pravos, et induci non posse, ut justitiam colunt*: And *Cicero*, that, *homines a natura noverca in lucem edi*, Men were brought into the world, by Nature their Step-mother, and are so prone, to evill by nature, that they cannot be brought to justice: And we have been taught by all, who will not be deem'd, as the followers of *Pelagius*, or advancers of *Arminius* that this is inherent in them, that Page 13, 14. 15, 16, 17.

s more then imputed: can they be fit for heaven whilst his abides in them?

Secondly, *Full, and proper baptismall Regeneration, doth in the formality of it, take away originall sin, in the guilt and punishment of it.* I pray Sir, what takes away the *power of sin, and prævitie of nature*, by reason thereof? In Rom. 6. (the best comment on this baptismall Regeneration) it is referred to the power, but not at all to the guilt, and punishment of sin; neither terme, nor thing, doth suggest your notion.

Thirdly, *Baptisme applyed to the infant, is not only a bare signe, but ceaseth to be a Sacrament, if it have not, as a divine institution, so a gracious operation by the spirit with the water:* Is not *efficacy* sufficient? but must the effect needs exist to make a Sacrament? what principle of nature, or morallity, will make the effect *forma informans* to the cause? Is not meat, true meat as it is nourishable, though it do not alwayes nourish? If you seale me a Bond, is the seale no assurance unlesse it assure me? Is not the Covenant, by you sworne, a solemne oath, binding your Conscience, because you have no grace to keep it, and I continue under suspicion, that you are not, nor will not be faithfull to it? Is the Spirit tied to the water, as of the esse of the Sacrament? What Divines teach it? or Scripture will defend it? Certainly Sir, you may well set the doore to the Lords Table, open to the vilest sinners; if the operation of the Spirit with the element be of the esse of a Sacrament, the worst of men shall at every communion be *converted*, or not *condemned:* But must they beleeve you, or the Apostle who saith, *He that eates, and drinks unworthily, eates and drinks his own damnation*; which how can he do, if not conversant about a Sacrament? is it not sufficient, to save the Sacrament from being *nudum signum*, a bare signe, in that it is *sigillum sigillans*, a seale efficacious, but it must be effectuall? Is there more required in Baptisme, then was required in Circumcision? and that was defined to be σημεῖον καὶ σφραγὶς a signe and seale of righ-

righteousnesse: The Apostle doth not add in his definition, as of the *esse* of the Sacrament, *and operation of the Spirit, with the circumcising knife or stone.*

4. *That there be two different kinds of regeneration, passive, and active, one for the infant, and the other for the adult estate.* Though the meanes and modus be various, you are the first that I know of, who hath taught the kinds to be different: I thought the operations of the Spirit had been like it self, the same in kind, unto all persons and capacities.

5. *If the baptized infant live unto actual sin, it hath no benefit of the baptismal grace, till it performe the evangelical condition of actual faith and repentance.* Is continuance in a visible Church state no benefit, or comes it not by baptism? Or doth actual sin, *ipso facto*, void it? Was, Sir, the baptisme of *John* and Jesus Christ the same, or no? If they were, *John* baptized *unto repentance*; and the Deacon urged *Elpidophorus* apostatized, to repentance, on the account of his baptism: And St. *Paul* makes baptismal grace an argument unto faith and repentance after actual sin: And all Divines have ever judged it, to be the great benefit of baptised persons, to be under such an engagement to the evangelical conditions of faith and repentance.

6. *That true grace, and regeneration, received in infancy, may by malicious and actual sins be quenched, and extinguished, as a weak fire, by much water.* And so, Sir, there is a total and final apostacy: The grace, and effect, which you say, is essential to baptism, to make it a Sacrament, may make all Infants, like *Rumbal* at *Brackly* in *Northamptonshire*, desire *to be baptised as soon as born*; and the danger of apostacy may make them desire *to die as soon as baptized.*

Happy parents, that see their baptised children well buried. Sir, your sense of baptismal regeneration; doth defend the necessity of baptism, suggested in your Liturgy: but Sir, consult second thoughts, and seriously consider, whether these be not some of the popish chaffe, and dross,

retained in the ſifting and refining of the Romiſh Miſſal, which had been avoided, by our firſt Reformers, if the Scriptures had been the fountain of their Service-book.

Theſe things, Sir, I will not ſay are your *ſentences ſyllabical*, but your *ſenſe*, ſo far as my little reaſon can take it, out of your rhetorical expreſſions: I hope you will not like them ſo well naked, as you ſeem to do when wrapt in your gorgeous mantle: Only Sir, I muſt adviſe, that you would keep reaſon, in ſubſerviencie to Scripture, the extravigancy of which, is the very forge and fence of *Arrian*, *Arminian*, and *Socinian* hereſie, and hath in your deſign, betrayed you into theſe errors: Take alſo a caution: take heed of defending a falſhood, whether in ſhew or ſubſtance; for you find you fly much from the truth, in fencing for the truth.

I ſhall, Sir, only trouble you with one thing more, and that is, your Apollogy for your *Muſick in publick, ſtanding, and ſolemn worſhip in your Cathedral Churches*. Certainly I believe there is as good authority for the one, as for the other; but I wonder to hear you ſay, that your *vocal and organical muſick is as lawful as any pſalmody*; whilſt the one is expreſly commanded, and directed by the Holy Ghoſt, and hath been conſtantly practiſed in the Chriſtian Church, even by Chriſt and his Apoſtles, and from their times, which you dare not affirm of your muſick, which yet you preſume to warrant in prayers, as well as praiſes: That *David praiſed God with inſtruments of muſick*, I grant, but that they were fixed in the Temple, and conſtantly uſed, in the ſolemn and publick worſhip, is that you muſt prove, and doth not to me appear. That muſick is good I grant, but that any or every good thing muſt be preſented to God, in his ſolemn worſhip, not called for, and preſcribed by himſelf, you will not dare to affirm.

Sir, chanting and ſinging divine Service invaded the Chriſtian Church, to the diſcontent of many of the moſt eminent Miniſters thereof; you ſhould do well to conſult

Athanaſius,

Athanasius, *Chrisostome*, the Decree of *Justin* the Emperour, and St. *Jerome*, in this case of canting musical service, and reconcile your fancie to their faith in this matter: May I advise you to cast an eye on the *Reliques of Rome*, and see what is there collected to your hand. I shall gratifie my Reader so far, as to transcribe two passages only, which may give an account of the esteem, which was of old had, of this merry musical way of solemn worship, the one of *Polidore Virgil*, the other out of *Cornelius Agrippa*, both sufficiently devoted to the Church.

Reliques of Rome, page 121, 122.

How greatly that ordinance of singing, brought into the Church by Pope Damasus, *and* St. *Ambrose, began, even in those dayes to be profitable,* St. Austin *declareth evidently, in the book of his Confessions, where he asketh forgiveness of God, because he had given more heed, and better ear to the singing, then to the weighty matter of the holy words: But now adayes* (saith Polidore) *it appeareth evidently, that it is much less profitable for our Common-wealth, seeing our singers make such a chattering charme in the Temples, that nothing can be heard but the voice; and they that are present, being content with such a noise as delight their ears, care nothing at all for the vertue, pith, and strength of the words; so that now it is come to this point, that with them common sort of people, all the worshipping of God seems to be in these singsters, although generally, there is no kind of people more light, nor more lewd; and yet the greater part of the people for to hear them, boing, bleating and yelling, flock into the Churches, as into some common game place: They hire them with money, they cherish and feed them, yea, to be short, they think them alone to be the ornaments and precious jewels of Gods House.*

Cornelius Agrippa writeth thus;

Now adayes musick is grown to such, and so great licentiousness, that even at the ministration of the holy Sacrament all kind of wanton and lewd trifling songs, with piping of Organs, have their place and course. As for the divine Service, and Common-prayer book, it is so chanted, minced, and man-

gled

gled of our coſtly, hired, curious, and nice Muſitians (not to inſtruct the audience withall, nor to ſtir up mens minds unto devotion, but with an whoriſh harmony to tickle their ears) that it may juſtly ſeem, not to be a noiſe made of men, but rather a bleating of bruite beaſts; while the children neigh diſcant, as it were a ſort of Colts; others bellow a tenour, as it were a company of Oxen; others bark a counterpoint, as it were a number of Dogs; others grunt out a baſe, as it were a number of Hogs; ſo that a foul, ill-favoured noiſe is made; but as for the words and ſentences, and the very matter it ſelf, is nothing underſtood at all, but the authority and power of judgment is taken away, both from the ears, and from the mind, utterly.

Sir, I ſhall trouble you no longer, I have taken but a ſuperficial glance of your Conſiderations, and theſe things lie obvious in the ſurface thereof, and ſeem in my eye no ſmall peccadillos, I thought it to be a duty, to recommend it with theſe general obſervations to your ſecond thoughts, and in favour to you, have not ript into the bowels thereof, by which, you would have been repreſented leſſe acceptable to the Church you pretend to take the charge of: I believe you will think I am ſomething ſmart in mine expreſſions, which I muſt not deny; you may poſſibly judge, it is the language of diſcontent, which if you do, you know looſers may have leave to ſpeak: Yet Sir, this is not the provoking Principle thereof, but the arrogancy of your Rhetorick towards Reaſon and Religion; you muſt, Sir, conſider the truth of that obſervation, *Cum omnis arrogantia ſit moleſta, illa ingenii, & eloquentia eſt moleſtiſſima:* Good men muſt have no leſſe courage for truth and piety, then bad men have confidence for errour, and iniquity: Some may poſſibly deem, the things by you urged to be light matters, rhetorical flouriſhes, fine expreſſions of your good affection to the Churches order and ornament, trifles in compariſon of the great affairs of Religion, and may plead, *cur amicum offendas in nugis*, why ſhould I offend

a friend, and Reverend Father about trifles? Such will give me leave to tell them, *Hæ nugæ ſera ducunt in mala*, theſe trifles tend unto ſerious evils, *corruption of Gods worſhip, ſtumbling of the weak, and ſtrength of the wicked* (who may well place all Religion in reading and regarding the Service-book, and rely thereon for ſalvation, having ſuch a Reverend Father in God to repreſent it to them, as the *unum neceſſarium*, all in all) *the diſhonour of his Sacred Majeſty*, by ſuch a Comment on his Royal Declaration, and *the palpable breach of the ſolemn League and Covenant*, whereby our King and Kingdome ſtand bound to God, to *indeavour the reformation of this* Church *in worſhip, according to the Word of God, and example of the beſt reformed Churches*, the guilt whereof will ſubvert both Church and State. Methinks Sir, the danger hereof ſhould reſtrain your Rhetorick, and confine you to your Pulpit, the proper place of an Oratour, and cauſe you to hold back your pen, till you can write better reaſon, and more ſound divinity, in order whereunto you cannot but take kindly, what, as a godly man, you will on ſecond thoughts ſee cauſe to deſire, and experience, as good for you, in the midſt of your greatneſs; *viz. Let the righteous ſmite me, it ſhall be a kindneſs, let him reprove me, it ſhall be an excellent oyle, which ſhall not break my head.*

FINIS.

ERRATA.

Page 3. line 11. for *ye* read *they*: pag. 8. l. 14. for *compaſſing* read *compoſing*: pag. 10. l. 22. for *expreſſe* read *expreſſion*: pag. 13. l. 22. read *contended*.